

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present case. Claims 1-21 were finally rejected in a Final Office action dated January 22, 2004 and those rejections were maintained in an Advisory Action dated April 22, 2004. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been further amended.

Claims 1-21 continue to stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,125,352 to Franklin et al in view of US Patent No. 1,657,411 to Scherbius further in view of US Patent No. 5,884,312 to Dustan et al. The rejection of claims 1-21 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 now contain a further limitation neither taught nor suggested by the combination of references cited by the Examiner. Specifically, claims 1, 8, and 15 now recite that the re-constructed document is generated in response to a "user error". Support for this term can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, page 14, lines 4-9 and in drawing Fig. 6. The Examiner's assertion in the Advisory Action that the Applicant's specification does not support the contention that the re-constructed document is re-sent in response to a user error is respectfully traversed. A fair reading of the specification, especially in view of the above-cited portion of the specification, as well as the specification as a whole, clearly supports the amendments to claims 1, 8, and 15. No new matter is therefore deemed to be added by these amendments. It is deemed that the references cited by the Examiner do not include this bona fide claim limitation found in all of the independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

For these reasons and for previously stated reasons, neither Franklin et al, nor Scherbius, nor Dustan et al, nor the combination thereof fairly teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 as now further amended. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are deemed to be patentable over Franklin et al, Scherbius, and Dustan et al taken either singly or in combination and are thus deemed to be allowable under 35 USC 103(a). Further, there is no motivation to combine the


references in the manner suggested by the Examiner to solve the problem addressed by the present invention for the above reasons and for previously stated reasons. Remaining claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are deemed to be allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

4/22, 2004


Peter J. Meza, No. 32,920
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5909 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax